Is the multiverse theory correct?

Bezverkhniy Volodymyr Dmytrovych, Bezverkhniy Vitaliy Volodymyrovich.
Ukraine, e-mail: bezvold@ukr.net

I do not want to upset anyone, but Einstein's theory of relativity (STR) strictly forbids the existence of multiverse. This follows from the simple fact that since there are different multiverse, they all exist in a certain non-material substance called "nothing".

"Nothing" is simply necessary to explain how different multiverse can exist simultaneously. In fact, this is a kind of "space" in which the multiverse exists. But, then the concept of "nothing" contradicts Einstein's theory of relativity, since it is essentially a return to the ether. Since Einstein's STR prohibits the existence of an absolute coordinate system, and to the environment that fills everything that exists, you can "attach" the coordinate system, and this system will be absolute, which is impossible. Therefore, the concept of "nothing" is the concept of ether.

Moreover, in the material world, nothing exists except matter and the space-time continuum, which we can study by experiment. Therefore, "nothing" and "multiverse" that exist outside of our space-time continuum (that is, outside the material world) do not differ in any way from the concepts of "hell" or "paradise" accepted in various religions. This strictly follows from the fact that we cannot describe them, since there is no matter, space, time, etc. Such a physical hell (or heaven).

In fact, "multiverse" and "nothing" is Plato's ideal world. Or what in religions is called the other world (hell, heaven). That is, the concept of the multiverse is an idealistic concept that has nothing to do with science, since science studies the material world (matter, space-time continuum). It is interesting to note that if earlier idealistic theories were purely philosophical theories (humanitarian), now some idealistic theories have a mathematical basis and claim to study nature, which is unacceptable. Obviously, the development of modern philosophy and logic must devise tools that will filter idealistic theories from scientific theories (which really help us study the Universe).

Note that in the scientific sense, idealistic theories cannot be useful to humanity and science, since they "study" the "worlds" beyond the limits of human knowledge. Science studies our material world, that is, our Universe (matter, space-time continuum), therefore, science has nothing to do with idealism. Idealism useful for study as gymnastics for the mind (we are not considering the religious and philosophical aspects now). No more.

Since we are discussing idealistic theories, we note that the Big Bang theory is also an idealistic theory. This follows from the fact that if spacetime expands (or space), then it must

expand in something. This is the so-called "nothing". But, this is completely wrong, since we are returning to the ether theory. Einstein's theory of relativity (SRT) prohibits ether. Moreover, if there was a Big Bang, then the Universe is finite, that is, it has certain boundaries. This is wrong again.

It turns out that the space-time continuum has a boundary. Like a birthday cake! And again we need to introduce the concept of "nothing" that exists outside the space-time continuum, that is, outside the material world. We cannot describe "nothing", since there is no matter, space, time, etc. In fact, "nothing" like "singularity" is again the ideal world of Plato. Or what in religions is called the other world (hell, heaven).

In this sense, the Big Bang theory is very similar to the biblical theory of the creation of the world. But, in religion, everything is logical: they admit an almighty Creator, and the fact that there is an ideal, immaterial world in which the Creator, angels, souls, etc. live. And then, in fact, without other assumptions, they develop their theory of the creation of the world.

In the Big Bang theory, there is also a Creator, that is, nature, which made the Big Bang. And there is also an ideal world that we cannot describe, since it is immaterial: "nothing", "singularity", "multiverse", etc. Therefore, the Big Bang theory is also a typical idealistic theory wrapped in a modern mathematical cover.

But, since the theory of the Big Bang does not correspond to reality, then scientists, as experimental data accumulate, constantly have to introduce new, fantastic, “ideal” concepts such as “dark energy”, “dark matter”, etc. Now, it’s probably time to introduce the concept of "light energy", which gives rise to the missing photons (but does not interact with matter in any way).

And that is precisely why (inconsistency with reality), the predictive power of the Big Bang theory is negligible. In fact, the Big Bang theory has helped scientists to systematize a large body of astronomical data, which pre-scientific theories have always done. Thanks to her for this, but this is where her role in science ends.

1. Quora: Is the multiverse theory correct? https://qr.ae/pNWDVl